

CAZON  
MA  
- 1970  
H27



**here today...  
here tomorrow**

URO  
70

ONTARIO DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS · november 1970



ATTENTION		INITIAL	
JUN 25 1971			
COPY TO			
REPLY	DATE	INITIALS	
FILE	PN	LH3	

*This volume was donated to  
the University of Toronto by  
Derek J.W. Little  
President, Municipal Planning  
Consultants Co. Ltd.*

7

H E R E

T O D A Y . . .

H E R E

T O M O R R O W

A REVIEW OF URBAN RENEWAL  
PROCEDURES IN ONTARIO

A special report prepared for  
the Department of Municipal Affairs  
by Mr. Homer Borland



7

ONTARIO DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

W. Darcy McKeough, Minister

W. H. Palmer, Deputy Minister

D. F. Taylor, Director, Community Planning

November, 1970.





Q  
NOV 26 1990

SUBSTITUTE 'R' CARD

Location ..... GOVT .....  
No. of Copies ..... 1 .....  
Binding .....

o 10143762

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction .....	1
Philosophy of Cost-Sharing .....	6
Present Approach .....	14
Joint Committees .....	24
Provincial Position .....	51
Future Approaches .....	54
Administration Proposals .....	67



CONTENTS

Page

1	Introduction
2	Philosophy of East-Asian Studies
10	Research Approach
20	Joint Committee
21	Researcher's Position
24	Other Approaches
27	Administrative Structure

2



## Urban Renewal

H E R E

T O D A Y . . .

H E R E

T O M O R R O W

### INTRODUCTION:

Federal aid for urban renewal, or urban redevelopment as it was once known, has been available under the National Housing Act since 1946. Provincial assistance in Ontario first began in 1958 through the Housing Development Act which limited aid exclusively to housing -- the removal of substandard housing and the replacement of it by federal-provincial partnership housing. Windsor "Stage I" is an example of this phase.

In 1959, the province broadened its aid to match the federal program of the time which required an area of redevelopment to have a substantial housing content either before or after redevelopment. "Bluewater" in Sarnia is the example of the new phase, followed by "Moss Park" in Toronto, "Van Wagner and Crescent Beach" in Hamilton, and "Stage II" in Windsor.

.../2






In 1964, both the federal and provincial programs were broadened considerably and the residential restriction removed in favour of blight, or all substandard conditions, as the underlying reason for the renewal of an urban area.

Historically, the administration of the program has its roots in the former Federal-Provincial Housing Partnership Program although, strictly speaking, there never was the legal partnership for overall urban renewal as was established for housing by formal agreements between the province and Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

In practice, however, the administration of the renewal program in terms of federal-provincial relations acknowledged the housing partnership principles and a close working relationship between the province and CMHC was developed in the 10-year period between 1958 and 1968.

Unlike the Province of Quebec, no master annual agreement between the province, as represented by the Department of Municipal Affairs, and Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation was entered into. Nor was there any understanding as to the amount of funds available or of limitations on the amount.



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2022 with funding from  
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761115474801>



Any intergovernmental program presents built-in administrative complications plus the hazard of confusing the objectives of the program with the means of achieving them. The urban renewal program was perhaps inhibited by two sets of agreements, one between a municipality and the province and one between a municipality and CMHC. The program was further complicated by the size and structure of CMHC -- with 14 local branch offices in Ontario, an Ontario Regional Office and a highly technical Head Office in Ottawa. The province, on the other hand, functioned with a limited administrative staff and only in the later years did it have the advantages of field representatives in regional offices - Port Arthur, Ottawa, Sudbury and, more recently, London.

It was recognized early in the program -- and underscored by the broadened policies introduced by the federal government in 1964 -- that an absolute maximum of coordination between the province and CMHC, and between these two levels of government and the municipalities, was crucial to prevent red tape strangling the program.

Several measures were taken to ensure that this would be the case:

1. Manuals were developed covering broad community-wide urban renewal studies, detailed studies of problem areas to develop schemes and procedures for implementing urban renewal schemes.





2. All initial contacts on urban renewal were channelled through the province.
3. Regular staff meetings between Department of Municipal Affairs and Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation's head office were held twice yearly between 1964 and 1968. Proceedings of the meetings were circulated to CMHC's regional office and to all local branches.
4. Close liaison was maintained with all CMHC branches in Ontario.
5. Arrangements were made to minimize duplication of functions and to use available provincial and CMHC resources to their best advantages.

In spite of the incipient administrative complexities, the program functioned relatively well although constant appraisal of administrative procedures was essential.

With the suspension imposed on urban renewal in October, 1968 by the federal government, the carefully developed liaison between the province and Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation faltered. Provincial manuals, revised and rewritten in accordance with earlier meetings, were held in abeyance pending some federal decision on the future of the program and a lack of confidence in the program became increasingly evident.





The municipalities, for whom the entire process had been established, became increasingly confused, increasingly dependent upon decisions both at the provincial and federal levels, and increasingly disenchanted with a program they were so enthusiastically encouraged to undertake.

In early 1969, the province -- in anticipation of a relatively early solution to the federal delay -- engaged Mr. Homer Borland to undertake a review of the administrative procedures and to recommend improvements. He was asked:

- to review the objectives, purpose and roles of the federal, provincial and municipal governments' involvement in urban renewal.
- to review existing federal and provincial agreements on the responsibilities of the contracting parties.
- to review existing procedures particularly on joint committees and the administration of the various agreements.
- to recommend changes in procedures and administration necessary to streamline the operation.

The continued delay of the federal government in arriving at a guide to its role in urban matters made the complete fulfillment of these terms of reference difficult. Nevertheless, the following report is submitted as a basis for the administration of both the current -- perhaps aborted -- program and for any future program involving the federal government, the province and the municipalities.





Urban Renewal

H E R E

T O D A Y . . .

H E R E

T O M O R R O W

PHILOSOPHY OF COST-SHARING

The urban communities of Canada are not old compared to ~~those of~~ other countries. But decay and obsolescence begin with birth and all communities inevitably feel their effects. Rapid growth, lack of comprehensive planning and design, cheap construction, changing transportation patterns, industrial development and population increase have contributed to unsatisfactory conditions in many communities. These conditions announce themselves in poor housing, in overcrowding and in lack of amenities as well as in dilapidated, poorly-located and obsolete commercial facilities. Urban sprawl -- the backlash of an attempt to get away from congested downtown areas -- and narrow streets of a bygone car-less age add to the problems of transportation and all of these constitute blight.

Blight has never been defined in legislation because of its many contributing ingredients, not all of which apply to every community. What constitutes blight in one community might not be considered



so in another. It is generally accepted that each community must establish its own criteria for blight, and ideas of what composes this phenomenon have changed considerably since the so-called slum clearance programs of twenty years ago.

Age and state of dilapidation were then the main standards, and the removal of the offending structures and their replacement by clean, safe and sanitary housing was thought to be the principal remedy.

It was later realized this was not enough and, since the environment was for people, "social blight" was included in the new lexicon. This involved many factors including the physical environment as well as amenities to improve interpersonal relationships.

The following, for example, lists some factors that must be considered in dealing with residential areas: mixed or improper land use, inadequate street pattern, poor municipal housekeeping of streets and underground services, lack of sufficient open space, inadequate or poorly located schools, lack of recreational facilities, lack of various kinds of social services needed in the area or neighbourhood, inadequate shopping facilities, poor public transportation, and last, but by no means least, overcrowded and poorly maintained housing.





In addition, of course, it became apparent that "economic blight" was present in many downtown and commercial areas, resulting in the flight of business enterprise to the suburbs and accelerating urban sprawl and its attending problems. Not only was there physical dilapidation of structures, but vacancies in stores and office space -- thus reducing the tax revenues of the municipality.

More important still was the strangulation of the very core of urban living: of employment, of entertainment, of shopping and of people themselves -- living, working, playing. Fragmentation of property ownership made it difficult for those who wanted to expand their operations. The developments that did take place were often not in the best interests of the general public and the total pattern of the community. As in the case of residential neighbourhoods, the street patterns and downtown parking facilities, which were adequate in the early days of development, no longer served satisfactorily.

The cost of remedying blight is high. The cost of taking no action is likely even higher. The cost in physical action may be measured in dollars, but the cost in human consequences is much more difficult to assess. The cost in economic terms is also difficult to measure, except for the very real effect on municipal revenues if conditions





are not remedied. In spite of the difficulties of assembling land, some downtown development will take place but again, such development may not be in the best interests of the community at large. Generally no development takes place in the backwash of the core area since, without public intervention, it may not be profitable for the developer.

Because of the high cost of eliminating blight in both residential and non-residential areas, the municipalities cannot carry out the necessary measures with their own limited resources. For this reason the federal government passed legislation years ago making contributions towards the cost. The legislation was amended as various needs were recognized. The Ontario Government under The Planning Act provides for contributions toward the municipalities' share of the costs.

Thus both senior governments supported the municipalities and for four of the past five years actively campaigned to encourage municipalities to become involved in the elimination of blight. Since eighty per cent of the total population will soon live in an urban environment, it seemed quite proper that the senior governments should support the improvement to the fullest extent possible within their financial resources and their overall priorities.



The Honourable John R. Nicholson, federal minister of the day, summed up the situation at symposiums held across the country during the winter of 1964-65. These quotes, extracted from his remarks at Sault Ste. Marie, illustrate the attitude of the federal government:

"While we have been busy with new opportunities, new ventures and new areas of our cities, we have in general tended to neglect the core - the downtown section, and a staggering multiplicity of additional demands arising out of this neglect is threatening to rend the very fabric of urban existence itself ... and I need not remind you ... that the presence of rundown areas and blight is an expense no municipality can afford to carry ... these are the major changes to the National Housing Act, whereby the federal government seeks to aid municipalities and provinces in bold programs of civic improvement. What we will do perhaps will not be done soon enough, or may not seem sufficient because the task is so immense. But we shall at least try, we shall attempt ... let us now face this task with renewed enthusiasm. Let us provide a finer concept of urban living and good accommodation and a healthy environment for those who would otherwise be forced to dwell in decay and despair."

Notwithstanding the assistance available from the senior governments, it continues to be the responsibility of the municipality to initiate the program, determine the treatment required, and carry it through to completion.

Urban renewal is a highly complex undertaking. It has introduced a new vocabulary to society in programs such as redevelopment, rehabilitation and conservation and in procedures such as the





urban renewal study, the scheme and the project implementation. It is an integral part of the urban process and must be treated as such and not -- as so many people think -- as an action in itself. It embraces all sectors of the municipal organization, both public and private, and requires delicate coordination to marshall all of these forces if the results are to be qualitative and satisfying.

The normal planning process of the municipality must recognize social and economic as well as physical planning. It is accepted today that in-depth planning for urban renewal is absolutely essential before any attempt to implement an urban renewal program is made.

The adoption of an official community plan is a prerequisite in both federal and provincial legislation to providing assistance. The quality of the plan itself and the by-laws that give it effect often leave something to be desired. It is hoped that municipalities will revise their official plans, updating them to provide the best framework for the development of the community whether by publicly-assisted urban renewal programs or by private entrepreneurs.





The legislation providing for assistance to the municipalities by senior governments is well known. Urban renewal studies enabled municipalities to identify problem areas and suggest priorities of action. These were assisted by grants of 75 percent by the federal government with the approval of the province. Urban renewal schemes encompassed the necessary economic, social, engineering and planning studies to develop an inventory of actions to improve the area selected. Government assistance was provided to cover the cost of the scheme preparation -- 50 percent from the federal government, 25 percent from the province. The cost of implementing the scheme (project) was in the same proportion. The municipality's share of 25 percent dictated the size of the area to be renewed. Emphasis is now placed on citizen participation in both the scheme preparation and implementation, along with rehabilitation of the structures preferred to clearance. It must be recognized the clearance is necessary when structures are physically incapable of economic rehabilitation or on planning grounds to make way for street improvements, parks, schools or other amenities required for improvement of the total environment.

As of December 1, 1969, in Ontario, 49 urban renewal studies have been or are being conducted at a total cost of \$1.2 million. Of these, 15 were undertaken prior to the 1964 amendments to the NEA



and have resulted in 20 projects and eight scheme preparations. The others have stimulated the preparation of 13 schemes, although six are still incomplete.

Since 1964, 32 scheme preparations have been authorized for a total cost of about \$2.0 million. Of these, 11 are incomplete. There are six waiting approval at the federal level, costing about \$300,000. Prior to 1964, seven projects were approved at a total estimated cost of \$24.5 million. Since then, nine projects were approved at a cost of \$105.3 million and seven projects at a cost of about \$61.0 million have been applied for, some of which have been approved for federal contributions in part. A further four projects for \$17.6 million are under consideration.

Total commitments for publicly assisted urban renewal are: studies \$1.2 million (federal participation \$.9 million); schemes \$2.3 million (federal \$1.2 million, province \$.6 million) and project \$195.3 million (federal \$97.7 million, province \$48.9 million).





H E R E

T O D A Y . . .

H E R E

T O M O R R O W

PRESENT APPROACH:

Probably the greatest criticism of urban renewal has been directed at the so-called bulldozer technique. Yet it should be remembered that, since 1964, of the 15 projects approved in Ontario, eight have included substantial areas of rehabilitation, with demolition limited to dilapidated structures or to provide space for housing, parks, school expansion, etc. The rest deal with central business districts where considerable demolition was necessary to provide for improved traffic and parking facilities and new buildings to correct the obsolescent features of the downtown and so revitalize the core of the urban environment for everyone in the community. Such public action is still considered necessary to stimulate private development and instil confidence in the area. Clearance as a tool of urban renewal is only used where rehabilitation is impractical to accomplish orderly development of the area being treated.

Another criticism is the designation of an "area for urban renewal" for which assistance from the senior governments is available. There are those who prefer dealing with various elements of renewal rather than taking the comprehensive approach. Most municipalities would be content to receive contributions to replace worn-out services without undertaking any other improvements, or to remove dilapidated structures without having to replan to provide better traffic patterns, open space, and other amenities. This might be interpreted as an



improvement but it would do little to remove the deficiencies that caused the deterioration in the first place.

Even this kind of treatment would have to be done within some defined boundaries to keep the undertaking manageable. It is suggested, therefore, that an area of manageable size be selected for comprehensive treatment so that everything needed can be done, confidence can be restored, and the area can begin again to perform a vital role in the community.

In accordance with the Ontario Planning Act, a municipality is required, with the approval of the Minister, to designate an area for redevelopment to qualify for contributions from the provincial government. This serves as the provincial approval necessary under section 23 of the National Housing Act. Premature designation of an area for renewal could destroy confidence in the area and create uncertainty as to its future. It is important, therefore, that official designation of the area for renewal (this was explained at the outset) be withheld until action in preparing or implementing the scheme is imminent.

An official community plan is a prerequisite for the preparation and implementation of urban renewal schemes. But this requirement has not always been recognized with the result that the basic planning





needed to arrive at the objectives of the community has not been done -- or has not been done well enough. Thus the scheme itself has often had to set out the planning goals for the area before attempting its proper purpose -- the detailed studies necessary to prepare an inventory of actions to be taken for area renewal. The high cost of preparing schemes is partially due to this.

In most cases, schemes for urban renewal are prepared by consultants working with the municipality. This is quite proper as few municipal staffs are geared to the extra work required. But there appears to be a tendency to employ a consultant and leave the work to him without the involvement of his political superior, the municipality.

But involvement of municipal staff cannot be avoided if a scheme acceptable to the municipality and the senior governments is expected. Staff costs for scheme preparation and implementation are acceptable for cost-sharing and it is important that these be recognized at the time application for approval is made. It is equally important that the municipality exercise prudence in its allocation of staff time to the cost of the scheme preparation and implementation. Too frequently, the extent of staff time required is overlooked, necessitating an upward revision of approved costs. There is also a tendency, once the inclusion of municipal staff costs is recognized,



to include staff time that might more properly be charged to normal municipal expense.

The extent of work to be done in the urban renewal area must essentially be decided by the municipality and indicated in the scheme. Municipalities have tended to gild the lily and go for improvements beyond what is reasonable for the area. Underground wiring, enlarged school yards and parks are proper in relation to the requirements of the area but should not be included just because the senior governments are contributing to the cost.

The scheme, once approved, must be carried through to completion, whether it is for the acquisition of properties to conform to the accepted plan or the rehabilitation of existing structures. Most projects have a favoured objective in the minds of the sponsors such as the elimination of substandard structures, the provision of school space, the creation of recreational facilities, a shopping mall, improved traffic pattern, and so on. It is not surprising that, once this objective has been achieved, enthusiasm for the rest of the comprehensive treatment tends to wane.

The municipal authorities, both elected and appointed, must understand that under existing legislation and agreements the municipality is





expected to do the total work indicated in the scheme. Approval of the application for either scheme preparation or implementation is not a blank cheque but a responsible undertaking to make contributions for specific jobs.

Urban renewal is the responsibility of the municipality to sponsor and carry out the work involved. The senior governments that are making substantial contributions are entitled to have the work carried out with due diligence and at the lowest cost consistent with the objectives. The interjection of senior governments in the process has been irritating and frustrating to many municipalities and probably could be considerably curtailed with less dependence on advice and direction from senior governments. At the same time, they must be assured that the program is being carried out efficiently and they must be kept informed of the progress of the work.

In the early days of urban renewal, the overview of the co-ordinating committee was important because of new and changing requirements. There have been instances where municipalities have relied heavily on the co-ordinating committee and involved it in decisions that should and could have been made by the municipalities but that were somewhat questionable. These committees are no longer required provided a means of expenditure control and project reporting can be found.



This involves establishing a competent and adequate staff within the municipal framework, close financial supervision and improved methods of reporting to ensure proper public accountability.

A serious criticism of the present urban renewal process relates to expropriation and compensation. Expropriation may not always be necessary but it does have the advantage of transferring title to the public body or of dealing with a hold-out owner or with properties where title is clouded. It therefore must be available -- but compensation must be payable without delay.

The recent changes in The Expropriation Act in Ontario will ensure the payment of fair compensation and the current practice of including appraisal and legal fees of the owner will remove most of the valid criticism from this part of the operation.

The present policy of rehousing families displaced as a result of urban renewal action appears to be working well. Public housing is being put in place at rentals related to income and relocation officers are helping families find their own accommodation as tenants or home-owners. But very little has been done to provide for single persons.





Rehabilitation assistance is still the subject of vigorous discussion. Only three projects in Ontario are ready for a concentrated program directed to property owners. In two of these the public improvement is virtually complete and steps should now be taken to persuade and help owners with improvements to their properties.

There is no provision in the National Housing Act for grants for loans with postponed interest and capital repayments. It is suggested that a pilot program be introduced in which all three governments participate, offering benefits to homeowners of low or fixed incomes and to elderly citizens to bring their properties to the minimum standards for use and occupancy. From this could be determined the cost, the acceptance and the effectiveness of such a program that could serve as the basis for legislative changes.

Some rehabilitation has been done by owners on their own resources but a concerted effort is needed for the rest. In addition to an information program, including financial aid, generous doses of patience will be required. The enforcement of standards by-laws should be used only as a last resort.

Citizen participation in preparing and implementing urban renewal schemes has been a requirement of the Government of Ontario for



several years. The experience so far has not been satisfactory. Because of the widely divergent views of different groups within a scheme area, it may be virtually impossible to establish a working committee to help municipal planners develop a scheme within the legislative limitations.

Again, people affected by urban renewal operations have a right to express their preferences in improvements within their neighbourhood. Certainly some practical means must be found to enlist support for any changes proposed in the urban renewal operation. Dr. Albert Rose, Director of the School of Social Work, University of Toronto, is now working on a study of citizen participation with a grant under Part V, National Housing Act. The report will likely be completed this year.

The urban renewal legislation in the National Housing Act refers to social studies necessary in the development of the scheme and, of course, its implementation. But there is no provision in the Act for the facilities considered necessary as a result of such studies.

The residents of urban renewal areas are likely to be in the low income category or at least close to the poverty line, and are likely to be more in need of social assistance than those in more



affluent parts of the community.

The province, through the Social and Family Services Department, using the facilities of the Canada Assistance Plan, can provide a certain level of social services as well as welfare. Municipal social planning councils can provide the services of volunteer agencies. But there appear to be gaps in the facilities available from these sources such as the capital cost of recreational facilities. And the municipalities themselves may be reluctant to initiate programs such as day nurseries for the children of working mothers because of their costs, even though substantial assistance is available from the Province. Thus there seems to be a deficiency in the social aspects of urban renewal which must be corrected to ensure a comprehensive treatment.

The management of properties acquired by the municipality and rented until required for demolition seems to be satisfactory. The collection of rents is still a problem and must be diligently pursued.

The organization of municipal staff to deal with urban renewal varies considerably. There has been evidence of conflict between the urban renewal officer and other senior municipal staff in some instances but on the whole the administrative set-up has been satisfactory.





As has been stated, urban renewal is part of the development process of the municipality and must be a cooperative effort of all agencies within the municipal framework. Proper organization can overcome many problems such as incomplete progress reports to senior governments, delays in municipal decisions, and can do away with the need for day-to-day supervision by the senior governments through joint committees.

The complexity of the municipal organization will depend on the size of the community and the extent of its normal activities. Obviously in smaller communities officials must wear two or three hats. But it is essential that responsibilities for renewal activities be placed definitely with an official qualified to see to it that the operation is carried through.

Subject to all of these observations, the administration of urban renewal activities is generally satisfactory. The high cost, particularly in non-residential areas, might be lessened by taking more care to eliminate the extras and by concentrating on a realistic approach to the essential parts of the scheme.

The needs of people, the creation of a vital and humane environment, are of far more consequence than the creation of testimonials to efficient civic design.



Urban Renewal

H E R E

T O D A Y . . .

H E R E

T O M O R R O W

JOINT COMMITTEES:

Introduction:

The origin of joint committees representing municipality, province and federal governments in urban renewal activity is not too clear. As early as 1952, when a federal grant was made available to the City of Toronto for the acquisition and clearance of the North Regent Park site, arrangements were made whereby the city acquired the properties with CMHC approval. No formal committee was created.

Prior to the decision to acquire and clear Regent Park South and rebuild with public housing in 1954, a high-level advisory committee of the City of Toronto, the province and CMHC was set up to determine the feasibility of the undertaking. The committee, through three sub-committees, engaged itself in the actual study of the cost of acquiring the land and of rebuilding.





When the decision to proceed was taken, the city acquired the property with agreement with CMHC as to price. The province was not involved in the clearance program but was a partner in the development of the buildings for the housing project to the extent of 25 percent of the cost, with CMHC in charge of the design and construction.

The first urban renewal study in Canada took place in the City of Toronto in mid-1955 as a research project. Federal legislation providing general assistance for urban renewal studies was not passed until 1960. An advisory committee was again set up consisting of two representatives from CMHC, the province and the Toronto Planning Board. The study was conducted by the director of the Toronto Planning Board and his staff. The chairman of the advisory committee was one of the CMHC representatives and the province provided the secretary. The committee held four official meetings to receive progress reports and to discuss means of meeting the objectives.

The first co-ordinating committee involved in an urban renewal project was established for "Moss Park", also in Toronto.

The first renewal scheme to be prepared in Canada was for Alexandra Park in Toronto. The city applied to the senior governments for



assistance in acquiring and clearing a T-shaped ten-acre site in November, 1960, for use as a public housing project with the buildings and the area to be improved at a later date.

In March, 1961, the provincial Minister approved a 25 percent provincial contribution towards acquiring and clearing provided the city would participate in formulating an advisory committee composed of city, provincial and federal governments charged with the "development of a plan of improvement" for the whole of the Alexandra Park area.

The advisory committee was formed in May, 1961, and through a working committee prepared a report which was submitted to the city in December, 1962, and which became, in most respects, an urban renewal scheme, as defined in the MIA. This report formed the basis of an application for assistance. The province paralleled the federal legislation passed in July, 1964.

#### Urban Renewal Studies:

As more municipalities applied for assistance in conducting urban renewal studies, the joint committee was given a more formal status.

"Urban Renewal Notes", prepared and issued by the Community Planning



Branch (Third Edition, 1961), refers to joint advisory committees. A condition of provincial approval, under section 21 of The Planning Act, was that the study be "generally assisted through a joint committee composed of representatives of the municipality, the Ontario Department of Municipal Affairs and CMHC." It further stated that a joint committee "following the study throughout its life will greatly assist implementation through a thorough knowledge at the provincial level of the background and objectives of the study and of the problems involved".

The purpose of the joint committee was to assist and guide the study to take any necessary action to ensure that the report attain its objectives.

The committee received the final report on behalf of the representative levels of governments. In achieving the general purpose, the committee might:

- hold regular meeting;
- receive and review progress reports;
- advise of progress payments between CMHC and the municipality;
- enlist the assistance and advice of any person or agency whose attendance at a committee meeting is thought to be helpful to the progress and quality of the report;





- formulate policy about publicity and public relations;
- undertake such other matters as the committee deems necessary to help the study attain its objectives.

During the period and up to 1965, the conduct of the studies was left to the discretion of consultants employed by municipalities. The agreements listed only the broad objectives. The committee's direct involvement with the consultant and his report was limited. The main purpose was to keep the work going and ensure local participation. No attempt was made to direct the form and content of the study report.

In 1966, the Community Planning Branch in collaboration with CIBC issued an urban renewal planning studies manual. This set out, in some detail, "the kind and degree of physical, social and economic information and analysis required". It identified data which would be useful in preparing an official community plan and the cost of covering such data which, if not already available, would be considered as sharable in communities of under 30,000 population. Other communities were thought to be able to finance the collection of such data without federal and provincial assistance. The additional data required to evaluate a renewal program were specified and costs associated therewith were sharable.



The administration of agreements covering the grants for the studies placed both the province and CMHC in much closer contact with the day-to-day conduct of the studies. While the province did not contribute to the cost of the study, provincial approval of the agreement between the municipality and CMHC was necessary and was given subject to the establishment of a joint liaison committee with one representative from the city, the Department of Municipal Affairs and CMHC. The purpose of the committee was "to advise and otherwise assist those responsible for conducting the study". Its function was "to establish and maintain a close liaison between the municipality, the province and the federal government in matters relating to the carrying out of the study".

In discharging its duties, the committee normally:

- held regular meetings in the municipality;
- received and reviewed progress reports;
- advised on progress payments between CMHC and the municipality;
- when requested by the municipality, enlisted the assistance and advice of any person or agency that could contribute to the progress and quality of the study;
- when requested by the municipality, assisted in formulating policy on publicity and public relations;
- undertook such other functions as are judged necessary to help the study achieve its objectives.





Because of the detailed outline of the work expected, it was thought advisable to have a technical sub-committee deal with planning and technical matters. Three meetings of this committee are virtually mandatory, first, to ensure that the objectives of the study and the methodology to be employed were understood before work commenced, second, to deal with the identification of problem areas and, third, to deal with the preparation of an urban renewal program. In practice, a technical sub-committee had been augmented by technical personnel thus making the technical sub-committee somewhat superfluous.

Contrary to the original intention of having an advisory committee and technical sub-committees advise and guide the conduct of the study, there was a tendency for the committee to actually direct the study. Such direction included comments on the content of the study report and recommendations for the inclusion of additional items so that the study becomes the brainchild of the committee, rather than of the municipality.

Part of the difficulty lay in the fact that the agreement between the municipality and its consultant did not always reflect the material which the municipality undertook to provide in its agreement with CIIC. Another was technical disagreement between the views



of the different technicians and personalities. Still another was the practice of some consultants to issue voluminous interim reports resulting in repetition, duplication, and the inclusion of a great deal of extraneous material.

#### Urban Renewal Projects:

In the early days of urban renewal implementation, CMHC instituted a co-ordinating committee for each project consisting of the senior local CMHC official and a representative of the municipality. This was done to facilitate the approval of all items of cost as required by the federal-municipal agreements. The committee was appointed at the time when the project was approved by the federal minister. Since there was originally no financial involvement by the province, no provincial representative was named for projects undertaken under section 23 of the National Housing Act.

The committee was expected to:

- co-ordinate the activities of the various departments and the parties to the agreement;
- prepare in cooperation with the appropriate technical advisors the program for the scheduling of demolitions, land disposal and reconstruction;



- ensure that the program was followed as closely as possible, and revise the program as may be necessary;
- eliminate bottlenecks and forestall possible delays, or take action to minimize them;
- review progress on all phases of the operation;
- deal with the day-to-day problems and seek from the principals direction on policy.

Authority was delegated to the CMHC representative to approve on behalf of the corporation:

- expenditures for the acquisition of properties in accordance with the formula on the assessed value;
- fees for professional and technical services;
- contracts for demolition and clearance;
- charges for the moving costs of dislocated families;
- proposed rents and operating expense for properties which the municipality may lease for a period of time prior to demolition.

Redevelopment projects began as slum clearance with the replacement by housing as in the case of Regent Park North. With the advances in federal legislation, changes in the approach by the various levels of governments were necessary. The province did not contribute financial aid to the acquisition or clearance operations in Regent Park North or Regent Park South. But when projects in Windsor, Sarnia and Toronto (Moss Park) were proposed, the pro-





vincial government reassessed its position and on September 17, 1958, Premier Leslie Frost announced that the province would contribute 25 percent to the costs of municipalities acquiring land in the redevelopment of depressed areas. The condition that land so recovered must be used for housing was changed in April, 1959, to permit 25 percent grants where it is used for housing either before or after clearance to coincide with the federal legislation.

When the province decided to make a 25 percent contribution to the cost of acquiring and clearing land for redevelopment projects, it sought representation on the co-ordinating committee. Because of the staff situation in the Community Planning Branch, it was agreed that the CMHC representative would speak on behalf of the province on minor day-to-day matters and clarify minor details. This did not cover policy matters or expenditure approvals which were reserved for the provincial minister in accordance with provincial-municipal agreements. Recommendations for expenditures and contracts were sent to the province for the necessary approvals.

As new projects came into being and the staff of the urban renewal section of the Community Planning Branch increased, the co-ordinating committee became a truly three-party arrangement, meeting as regularly as the work load permitted. Major responsibilities



were the approval of acquisition and demolition costs and contracts, the receipt of progress reports, recommendations for the disposal of land, changes in new land use, and determination of other policy matters from their principals. Usually, an appraisal sub-committee was asked to review values of properties to be acquired and recommend settlements to the co-ordinating committee.

With the 1964 changes in the federal legislation and the decision of the province to contribute its 25 percent share of all costs recognized as sharable, the operations of the co-ordinating committee intensified. There were now two operations in which the committee was involved: the preparation of schemes and their implementation. Meetings usually were held monthly to guide and advise the project director, to receive progress reports and approve all expenditures. Because of the planning, engineering, social and economic implications of both scheme preparation and implementation, technical sub-committees had to be appointed. But in many cases the co-ordinating committee, supported by its technical advisers, was able to deal with these details.

In 1964, CMHC issued instructions to its officers outlining the functions of the committee:



- co-ordinate the activities of the various departments to the agreement;
- review in cooperation with the appropriate technical advisors the program for the scheduling of property acquisitions, demolitions, required municipal services or works and land disposal;
- ensure that the program is followed as closely as possible, and to revise the program as necessary;
- eliminate bottlenecks and forestall possible delays, or take action to minimize them;
- deal with all problems related to the project, and seek from the principals answers to any policy questions which arise;
- review progress in all phases of the urban renewal scheme.

In 1966, the province, in collaboration with CMFC, prepared manuals for scheme preparation and implementation. The specific duties and responsibilities of the co-ordinating and technical sub-committees were set forth in some detail.

#### 1. Scheme Preparation:

##### Co-ordinating Committee :

The role of the co-ordinating committee is to review the progress of the scheme preparation as reported by the technical sub-committee;

- seek from their principals answers to policy questions that may arise;





- ensure that the terms of the agreement are being followed;
- assist in formulating policy on publicity and public relations;
- advise on progress payments and claims under the agreements.

Technical Sub-Committee:

- advise co-ordinating committee on all technical matters arising out of scheme preparation;
- make technical services available to the municipal planners and consultants involved with the understanding that consultants should respond to questions such as planning, architecture, engineering, appraisal, economics and sociology;
- meet as often as necessary during the preparation of the scheme at the request of any representative of the sub-committee or the consultants involved.

2. Frequency of Meetings:

A minimum of three meetings should be held:

- at the outset of the scheme preparation to hear from those responsible for the intended procedure, techniques, work program, and initial technical problems;
- at the completion of the overall scheme to discuss and review its proposals in the light of the alternative courses of renewal action which have been considered, and
- at the completion of the detailed proposals for the first phase of the project.



### 3. Scheme Implementation (Project):

#### Co-ordinating Committee:

- concur in expenditures as required by the agreements;
- ensure the scheme is implemented under the agreed terms;
- consult with their principals on policy matters, and on matters not specifically provided for under the agreements;
- receive progress reports;
- consult with other persons as special problems of administration develop, changes in the original scheme appear, or the consideration of disposal techniques is necessary.

#### Sub-Committees:

- deal with special problems, e.g. appraisal sub-committee to consider acquisition prices for recommendation to the co-ordinating committee.

The principal functions of the joint committees may therefore be summarized as:

- to approve expenditures made or to be made by the municipality;
- to receive progress reports;
- to consider and rule on policy questions with or without reference to their principals;
- to assist in the prosecution of the work in accordance with the agreements.



A review of the operations of the co-ordinating committees in both scheme preparation and implementation indicates that the committees are being more and more involved in the day-to-day operations:

- Most if not all day-to-day problems could and should be resolved by municipal staff.
- Major expenditures are being handled satisfactorily but some expenditures are presented to the co-ordinating committee for approval without the careful scrutiny that would be given if the municipality were paying the cost with its own funds -- thus making the committee share the responsibility for the higher costs.
- Progress reports are not as informative as they might be and often seek questionnaire-type answers from the committee rather than statements about the actual situation or recommendations about specific action.
- Policies have now been well established and there is now less need for such decisions by the committee.
- The programming and prosecution of the work is a matter for the municipality and no urging or direction by the committee should be necessary.

#### Meetings and Cost:

A review of the meetings of the advisory committees to urban renewal studies indicates the average number of meetings on each study to be about five, which is two more than should be necessary. Representatives of CMHC averaged three with two coming from outside the municipality. The province averaged about two with most of





the attendants coming from Toronto. Most meetings are concluded in half a day or less and local representatives have claimed no expense other than their time.

But provincial and most CMHC personnel must take a full day for travel with the meeting involving travel and time expense. It would appear that transportation and incidental travel expense would cost about \$60 per trip plus \$40 to \$50 in time -- or \$100 daily for provincial and CMHC personnel from outside the municipality and \$25 per meeting for those living in the community. Assuming eight persons attend three local, three CMHC (two outside) and two Province (1½ outside) the cost for each meeting was \$75, \$25, \$200, \$12.50, \$150, = \$462.50. Cost to the province averaged \$162.50 per meeting and to CMHC \$225.

For scheme preparations, the number of meetings and the attendance varied widely. In London, there were 10 meetings in 31 months. In Port Arthur, 17 meetings in 16 months. Kitchener, 16 in 21 months (including four technical sub-committee meetings). Brantford, 20 in 14 months (of which 10 were technical mostly held the same day). So the average was a meeting every six weeks for an average time of 20 months, or 12 meetings for each scheme.



The attendance also varied, particularly with municipal representation. The Province averaged two and CMHC three. The costs referred to would likely apply -- \$162.50 per meeting for the province and \$225 for CMHC. Thus the cost to the province for the four schemes reviewed amounted to \$1,950 each. These were "on-site" costs and do not include time spent by the provincial staff while in the Toronto office.

If the co-ordinating committee meetings could be reduced to three, some \$1,500 could be saved in on-site expense but there would be an increase in the cost of supervision or review at Toronto.

Most schemes have been prepared by consultants and the above costing does not take their expenses into account. Presumably they would continue to meet with municipal staff but the number of formal sessions might be reduced.

Implementation of schemes was also subject to the overview of co-ordinating committees which generally met monthly. Similarly, appraisal sub-committees met monthly in the active acquisition stage to recommend settlements for property to be acquired. Provincial representation was usually limited to one person at a cost of about \$100 per meeting. CMHC generally had two or three but sometimes as many as eight in attendance. Most of this rep-



resentation would be local but it is estimated that the cost would be about \$112.50 per meeting ( $\frac{1}{2}$  from outside and  $2\frac{1}{4}$  local). If a project were to take five years to implement, as many as 60 meetings might be held. As a matter of fact, the seventieth meeting of the Alexandra Park Co-ordinating Committee was held November 10, 1969.

While these costs are considerable in themselves compared to the total costs of renewal activities, they are not significant in assessing the value of the committees compared to the overall expenditures.

Probably the most important element of joint committee costs -- and the least measurable in dollars -- was the loss of time in waiting either for the meeting or for the decision of the committee. While certain approvals were required of the senior governments, the municipality remained responsible for pushing the work forward. It should not be necessary to wait three or four weeks or longer for a meeting of the committee before taking action. Such delays can be costly to all parties.

With the issuance of new ground rules and directions on the methodology





of the study, the committee took an active part in the details of the consultants' work. The consultants did not always agree that the procedures indicated in the manual were the best and this necessitated much discussion over techniques. The many reviews of interim and draft reports resulted in changes in their form and content and these were done in the best interests of the municipality as interpreted by the senior government members of the committee. While this might be considered a laudable objective, it could also be looked upon as an infringement of the rights and views of the municipality -- particularly if it had the resources to arrive at its own subjective judgment about its own needs. Some overview may still be required and it might well be exercised by the province without becoming involved in details.

Similarly, the activities of the co-ordinating committee have changed. Originally the concern of the committee was directed to the acquisition and clearance of a predetermined list of properties and the rehousing of displaced families. The re-use of the cleared land had usually been determined before the project was undertaken or deferred for a later decision. Policies on expropriation, compensation, property management prior to demolition, relocation and allowances were developed. Day-to-day problems arose which required joint decisions. But there were principally of a financial nature.



The passing of federal legislation in 1964 provided for assistance not only for acquisition, clearance and re-housing, but for social, economic and physical planning studies and for the improvement of municipal installations. A new set of procedures for applying these provisions had to be developed even though the principles were already in legislation. The municipalities were expected to initiate programs but the interpretations of both the province and CMHC had to be applied. The co-ordinating committee was considered as the natural forum for discussion and decision.

The Scheme Preparation Manual and Scheme Implementation Manual outlined many of the policies in detail. While municipalities and their consultants might well have proceeded on their own in scheme preparation, the co-ordinating committee was an established fact and the municipalities continued to use it.

Many points were raised in the committee that could have -- and should have -- been decided upon by the municipality and its consultant. Even some expenditures for which federal and provincial approval was required were recommended without the scrutiny they deserved -- and probably would have received -- had the municipality been paying the total cost.



The need for policy decisions had largely disappeared but the committee was still involved in receiving progress reports and approving expenditures. The latter included property acquisitions which were more complicated in view of rising prices, shortage of alternative accommodation, expropriation routines, commercial as well as residential properties and so on.

This resulted in a more technical approach by the appraisal sub-committee. At the same time progress reports, other than brief verbal statements, were non-existent and gave little indication of the true status of the total undertakings. Thus the meetings of the co-ordinating committees had become more routine and less exacting and the meetings of the appraisal sub-committee even more technical.

Evaluation:

There is no question that the activities of the advisory and co-ordinating committees have been of tremendous value in the development of urban renewal in Ontario and across the country. The introduction of financial assistance to municipalities from the federal and provincial governments for urban renewal activities made explanation of what was expected imperative. Direction as to acceptable





procedures, as well as safeguards that the money spent would achieve the desired results, was necessary.

Urban renewal under public auspices was new. It required new terms and definitions. Beginning with slum clearance and the replacement by decent, safe, and sanitary housing, and proceeding through various phases, it finally was recognized as an effective means of improving all aspects of the urban environment. It was early considered to be a part of the planning process and it demanded conformity with an official community plan. But even now there are many in municipal circles who consider renewal to be something separate, to be pursued for itself alone, a means of introducing federal and provincial money into municipal coffers.

It is difficult to see in retrospect how this whole process could have been advanced without the discussions of the members of the joint committees, without their knowledge of the local situation and their understanding of the objectives of the senior governments. Yet it is now evident that the work of these committees -- having gone through the stages of advice and guidance to policy-making and outright direction -- has reverted to routine approvals and sometimes unnecessary discussion.



On top of this, physical, social and economic planning have gained greater currency at the municipal level. There are better trained staffs to deal with technical affairs both within the municipal structure and with outside consultants. The formal meetings of joint committees may well have come to the end of their usefulness. Alternative means can be formed to accomplish the same ends of expenditure approvals and progress reviews.

The policy on new situations could be determined by other means as well. There would be considerable saving in time of both CMHC and provincial personnel in eliminating regular joint meetings. The responsibility for urban renewal should remain with the municipality. Needed supervision could still be provided by provincial representatives scheduling inspection trips in an organized manner.

Proposals:

Studies:

It is uncertain today whether federal funds will be available for more urban renewal studies. Should this operation be continued, it is proposed that meetings of the advisory committee be limited to a single meeting at the commencement of the study. Progress reports on the status of the work should be insisted



upon but detailed interim reports should be discouraged. Draft final reports submitted to the province for comment prior to printing should ensure the adequacy of the coverage without interference with the municipality or its consultant as to the actual form and content. In small communities (under 30,000 population) the province might well insist on the production of a satisfactory official plan, or amendments to existing plans that reflect the study, within a period of six to 12 months.

Scheme Preparation:

The present agreements between the municipalities and CMHC and the province require a co-ordinating committee. As mentioned previously, the need for policy decisions has largely disappeared. Most of the remaining functions of approving expenditures and receiving progress reports can be done without the committee.

It is proposed, therefore, that regular meetings of the co-ordinating committee be discontinued. These would be replaced by the regular progress reports submitted to the province and CMHC, or to the province which would inform CMHC. Expenditures would be approved on the submission of claims for reimbursement by the municipality.





Special expenditures outside the normal could be recommended by the municipality for prior approval in case of doubt as to its acceptability. Questions on policy not already determined could be submitted to the province for consultation with CMHC and a decision arrived at.

A special meeting of the co-ordinating or joint committee could be held at the commencement of the scheme preparation to ensure all parties were aware of the requirements for its conduct. Special meetings could be held during the scheme preparation if any of the parties felt this was really necessary. Technical people would be available as required. And prior to the publication of the scheme report, the draft would be submitted for comment to the province and possibly CMHC.

This would ensure that the work comprising the scheme has been carried out in full and the basic requirements of a scheme has been covered. Only general statements as to its acceptability for cost sharing could be given at that time since it would still require acceptance or amendment by the municipal council.

Thus, the municipality would assume full responsibility for the operation whether by its own staff or by a consultant. In either case, this would include the prudent deployment of funds and personnel.



Projects (Scheme Implementation):

As with scheme preparation, the agreements place the responsibility of implementation with the municipality and provide for the province and CMHC to approve expenditures of all kinds. With a properly prepared scheme and prompt action in implementation, there should be little need for major changes to the scheme.

Consequently, there is little need for regular frequent meetings of the joint committee to discuss policy matters. The acquisition of properties, for which provincial and CMHC approval is required, is essentially a municipal activity and operates in Ontario in conformity with the Expropriation Act 1968-69.

The policies here are well established. It seems unnecessary for an appraisal sub-committee representing the three parties to submit their recommendation to a co-ordinating committee of the same parties for approval. Instead, it is proposed that the municipal officials responsible for acquisition -- either themselves or with the assistance of the CMHC appraiser -- prepare and submit their recommendations and supporting data to the province for approval on a regular basis. To satisfy the requirements of the CMHC agreement, the province could obtain CMHC approval prior to advising the municipality.



As in the case of scheme preparation, the municipality would submit regular progress reports and claims for reimbursement together with requests for doubtful items to the province for approval. Policy questions could be handled in the same way. Meetings of the co-ordinating committee could be called by any of the parties to the agreements if it were considered necessary for any reason.

Supervision of municipal activities in urban renewal would be provided by the Community Planning Branch of the province. This would be done by regular visits to the municipalities on an organized basis and through comments on the progress reports and correspondence on specific enquiries. It would be understood that CMHC staff would be able to visit municipalities with the provision that any necessary directions would be transmitted by and through the province. But the responsibility for urban renewal activities rests with the municipal governments in conformity with the normal planning process and they are expected to exercise prudence in urban renewal as in their other undertakings.





Urban Renewal

H E R E

T O D A Y . . .

H E R E

T O M O R R O W

PROVINCIAL POSITION:

A submission, dated October 15, 1969, to the federal minister by the Honourable W. Darcy McKeough, stated in summary as follows:

- A. The Government of Ontario proposes that the federal government allocate a fixed sum of money on a yearly basis, but with commitments over a block of five or more years, with Ontario setting priorities and procedures regarding the disbursement of funds along with Ontario's own contribution to the municipalities.

On the basis of current projects, projects applied for but not approved, and expectations resulting from current studies and Ontario's own budgetary limitations, the federal contributions would be some \$50 million, or \$10 million per year. It is pointed out that current projects commit the Federal Government to some \$22.4 million.



- B. The Government of Ontario proposes to continue to support those municipalities that are carrying out programs in response to federal-provincial encouragement over a number of years, and urges the federal government to honour its moral, if not legal, commitment also.
- C. The Government of Ontario proposes to reduce substantially both federal and Ontario involvement in the day-to-day administration of urban renewal schemes as presently found in the form of committees, comprising of representatives of federal, Ontario and municipal governments.
- D. The Government of Ontario proposes to undertake a comprehensive philosophical review of the urban renewal programs as found in Ontario between 1946 and 1968, but with emphasis on programs that started after the comprehensive changes to the NHA in 1964.
- E. The Government of Ontario proposes to encourage the continued involvement of citizens during the planning and implementation stages in urban renewal and to explore ways and means of developing more meaningful techniques to ensure that citizen participation is a positive force in community affairs.



- F. The Government of Ontario proposes to continue to insist that municipalities adopt comprehensive official plans, together with adequate development and maintenance controls, prior to funds being made available for urban improvement.
- G. The Government of Ontario proposes to embark upon a rehabilitation demonstration project in an endeavour to gain experience on rehabilitation techniques, costs, etc. It is proposed that federal funds be made available for this purpose.

As of December 1, limited federal contributions have been approved for a few deferred projects but there has been no reaction to the specific proposals of sections A, B, C and G above.





Urban Renewal

H E R E

T O D A Y . . .

H E R E

T O M O R R O W

FUTURE APPROACHES:

The responsibility for urban renewal must continue to be at the local level. The exercise of this responsibility must be undertaken without excessive reliance on senior governments. Prudent proposals for the expenditure of public funds, even though 75 percent comes from outside the municipality, will enable the other levels of government to withdraw from day-to-day decisions.

The policies under the present legislation have been well established and the municipality should be able to conduct its affairs with a minimum of supervision from the province or CMHC. The production of complete progress reports should be enough to satisfy the senior governments that the objectives are maintained, resulting in a minimum of interference.



As a first step in assuming its responsibilities, the municipality should create and maintain a community development plan (official community plan) as background against which zoning by-laws, building by-laws, capital works programs, public and private development and urban renewal schemes are cast. No urban renewal schemes should be contemplated or considered by the senior governments until an adequate community plan, with the appropriate by-laws, is prepared and adopted by the municipal council and approved by the provincial minister.

The second step is the establishment of a municipal organization capable of dealing with urban renewal activities. This should not be dependent on a separate, fully staffed department but should be arranged to direct and co-ordinate the activities of the several civic departments as needed. Specialists dealing with public relations, citizen participation and relocation will be required in addition to legal, engineering and special expertise from the respective civic departments.

In addition to the official plan, a municipality looking for contributions under the urban renewal legislation should be required to prepare a municipal works program for, say, five years and an annual maintenance budget to provide for municipal house-keeping. Contributions from senior governments would then have



the effect of advancing the contemplated works and catching up in areas of blight and substandard conditions. They would thus contribute to the orderly development of the municipality physically, socially and economically.

In the preparation of the official plan and development program, a municipality will consider a great many individual and inter-related elements. To maintain its vitality, a municipality must undertake a program of housekeeping and improvement, whether or not it seeks contributions from senior governments under urban renewal legislation.

The elements listed here must be considered in any urban renewal activities supported by public funds. While the lists may not include all items, they should serve as an indication of the factors to be reviewed:

1. Re-planning to provide for:

- Residential, commercial and industrial use.
- Improved street pattern.
- Transportation and parking facilities.
- Parks and open space.
- Social and recreational facilities including libraries.
- Schools at all levels of education.
- Shopping facilities.



2. Acquisition and clearing of structures incapable of economic rehabilitation, including spot clearance:

- Acquisition of structures on planning grounds or the assembly of land for development, public and private.
- A program of relocation for persons, families or commercial ventures displaced because of clearance.

3. Program of rehabilitation of structures of whatever use.

The adoption and enforcement of by-laws covering minimum standards of maintenance and occupancy to protect deterioration and conserve existing structures and their surroundings.

4. Replacement, improvement or installation of services commensurate with the requirements of the community such as:

- |                   |                      |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| - sanitary sewers | - storm sewers       |
| - water lines     | - tree planting      |
| - roads           | - curbs and gutters  |
| - road surfacing  | - sidewalks          |
| - street lighting | - hydro distribution |

5. Development of cleared or vacant land.

6. Provision of the following and allied services, if required:

- Medical care: hospitals, out-patients clinics, home nursing, etc.
- Welfare services.
- Manpower retraining and adult education.





- Employment opportunities.
- Social programs: public and voluntary agencies.
- Child day-care centres.
- Youth centres.
- Case-work for multi-problem persons.
- Counselling in budgeting, sewing, child care, etc.
- Housing for families, elderly people and individuals.

7. Administrative arrangements and expenses.

It might be useful to point out that the constituent parts of an urban renewal scheme are outlined in section 23a, National Housing Act and further enumerated in the Ontario Scheme Preparation Manual. This constitutes an inventory of remedial action to be taken. But it does not mean that all elements should be included unless they are needed to eliminate the blight and substandard conditions within the area. The comprehensive nature of the scheme demands that all deficiencies must be made good, but if some elements show no deficiencies, no action is required. The scheme merely indicates that such elements are satisfactorily supported by such investigations that have been done.

Under the National Housing Act, contributions may be made towards the cost of economic, social and engineering studies and planning



in the preparation of schemes for urban renewal. But in implementation, the assistance, apart from staff, has been confined to physical actions and installations. Contributions to public housing have been specifically excluded.

In future programs, increased attention should be given to the social needs of the people affected by urban renewal activity. Assistance is available through provincial and federal programs apart from the housing legislation. The needs should be defined during the scheme preparation and means of assistance available through such agencies as the social and family and education departments thoroughly explored. The resulting project will then reflect a truly comprehensive approach. Serious gaps in the assistance available might well form the basis of recommendations for changes in the legislation.

The possibilities of assistance towards physical changes outside the urban renewal legislation, such as Department of Highways participation, OWRC installations and sewer loans, should be looked into. Various forms of housing for special groups within the community should also be investigated with the appropriate government bodies.



In reviewing the above list of actions which purports to be a comprehensive approach to the elimination of blight and substandard conditions, it is difficult to decide what elements can be eliminated from these actions. It would be inadvisable and perhaps inexcusable, for example, to renew underground services and leave dilapidated structures standing and in use. The planning or re-planning must take place first.

A case is made therefore for the implementation of the whole of a comprehensive scheme including the social aspects mentioned above. It may have to be implemented in stages to fit the resources of the community assisted by the senior governments.

A corollary to the comprehensive approach to a project within the financial resources of the community is that projects must be for a defined area. The area may be large or small but should be large enough to be relevant and worthwhile. If a project is too large to be completed within a reasonable time (say five years) it may have to proceed in stages. But for the reasons mentioned, the stage area selected should be treated in a comprehensive manner. In this way confidence in the particular area is restored.





There is nothing new in the suggestion that central business districts continue to receive attention for urban renewal treatment.

If the CBD or a part of it is in need of renewal and is selected as the top priority by the municipality, it should be included in the cost-sharing arrangements of the senior governments.

Otherwise the core of the community will continue to deteriorate with a resultant loss of confidence not only of the residents but of visitors and potential investors in the community.

The only new approach to urban renewal in the CBD may be the exercise of prudence in the land-use plan and design work to avoid all but necessary costs. There seems no doubt that the high cost of CBD renewal and the large extent of clearance involved is the cause of the present disfavour into which CBD renewal has fallen, both in the United States and Canada. Less ambitious undertakings may still be effective.

Rehabilitation has always been advocated in renewal programs but has been expressed as an outer objective rather than as part of the program itself. It is time that definite rehabilitation arrangements be included in the scheme preparation and that implementation be commenced as soon as the required public works have reached the place where rehabilitation is both practical and



desirable.

Persuasion, advice and patience are the watchwords of rehabilitation. Property owners will have to be motivated and stimulated by persuasion. They will likely need professional and practical advice on how to proceed. And patience must be exercised to see hopes become reality.

At present there is no provision for financial assistance except the traditional home-improvement and mortgage loans and these may be difficult to obtain. For some, such loans may also be hard to repay. It is to be hoped that new legislation may provide financial help in such cases. But other forms of assistance may be equally important and can be provided by the municipality at no cost to the residents. Appendix "A", attached, suggests some of the help that may be made available.

There is need for municipal by-laws covering the minimum standards for maintenance and occupancy mentioned previously. They should be administered as part of the conservation program but enforcement procedures must be used only as a last resort, particularly for those in the low-income group.



Citizen participation is an integral part of the renewal process. But experience to date has not been too satisfactory and in some instances has resulted in an attempt to exercise citizen power rather than participation. More effective means of obtaining a working arrangement with citizen groups, often with widely divergent views as to the objectives and approach, must be found. Studies are now being conducted on this matter which hopefully will assist municipalities in enlisting the co-operation of the residents. In the meantime the "Three R's of Citizen Participation", published by the Department of Municipal Affairs, will be helpful.

These comments on new approaches to urban renewal presume some improvement and extension of the present federal legislation although the techniques of scheme preparation and implementation would be the same. It assures the senior government that their contributions are used to achieve the results anticipated when approval was given and that a detailed program has been worked out by the municipality.

There are those who feel that this approach is too restricting to municipal governments and that the municipalities should be given complete freedom of decision and action. At the same time they feel that the federal government should assist municipalities



in meeting the problems of urban development. Undoubtedly the province would be expected to supplement and complement the federal and municipal funds.

A possible change might be as follows:

The federal government in its concern for allocation of funds might decide to make money available for urban development to the extent of \$7.50 per person during a five-year period. This would result in a fund of \$150 million or \$30 million annually. If this were allocated to provinces on the basis of population, Ontario would have about \$10 million annually.

The grants could be unconditional, in which case they could be used for any purpose, or there might be certain conditions limiting their use to urban improvement generally or even to specific undertakings such as the present scheme implementation.

It will be recalled that the municipal loan fund was allocated on the basis of population within each province, and that applications had to have the blessing of the province which thus had some influence on the work involved. Similarly, sewer loans under the National Housing Act are for basic sanitary sewerage disposal and must carry provincial approval in Ontario through the Ontario Municipal Board and Ontario Water Resources Commission.





The province might consider allocating funds to the extent of 50 percent of the federal grant provided the municipality contributed an equal amount toward the work in hand. This would maintain the present participation of 50-25-25. Whether or not the federal government imposed conditions on its grant, the province should insist on knowing what the municipality proposed to do. The conditions of the grant, for which there would be no recovery when properties acquired are developed, could be limited or could be similar to the present scheme arrangement.

Since what is proposed here is a grant and not a loan, it seems inevitable that the province must have some supervision over the expenditure of funds, whatever the source. It would be expected, of course, that the responsibility of initiating and carrying out such a program would lie ultimately with the municipality.



Urban Renewal

H E R E

T O D A Y . . .

H E R E

T O M O R R O W

ADMINISTRATIVE PROPOSALS:

If the federal government declines to accept the provincial proposals of October 1969 and waits until new ground rules are established before accepting new applications, the province must work with projects already approved. Alternatively, the province could consider taking independent action although this might be hard to justify in view of the federal legislation and the promotion given to the program by the federal authorities.

One of the most time consuming and irritating operations for all levels of government is the review of municipal administration costs. This includes salaries and expenses of municipal staff and contracted services engaged in renewal activities together with supplies of one kind and another provided by the municipality.

.../68



To avoid these detailed reviews of administrative costs presently included in cost-sharing agreements, it might be better to allow a fixed percentage of the money paid in settlement in acquiring properties for administrative purposes. The municipality could claim their costs for the various operations progressively until the ceiling is reached, after which expenditures would not be shared.

The figures suggested are based on the estimates for four projects - Ottawa Lower Town, Toronto Alexandra Park, Sudbury and Port Arthur, and may be too generous. Certainly, social considerations and assistance in the rehabilitation of remaining structures must be amply provided for. Further studies of past charges are necessary to refine the details if this is deemed to be a feasible approach.

Appendix "B" of the Implementation Manual, which deals with eligibility for cost-sharing items under 23b of the National Housing Act, would be amended to provide for:

- a) Site office equipment and supplies, including furniture and publications not to exceed a fixed sum to be stated in the agreement. Twenty thousand dollars seems a reasonable figure for a five-year operation, allowing \$6,000 for the first year and \$3,500 for each of the four following years.





In claiming the federal and provincial share, no breakdown of items would be required. The actual amount would depend on the project and be determined upon for inclusion in the agreement. Any excess costs would be the responsibility of the municipality.

- b) Municipal costs for administrative and other staff engaged in acquiring properties, relocation and public information would be limited to a fixed sum related to the estimated cost of settlement for properties to be acquired. Expense up to this amount would be shared by the senior governments while any excess would be the responsibility of the municipality. The percentages indicated are applicable to projects with a substantial residential content and revision would be necessary in accordance with the circumstances of each project.

The following breakdown of administrative functions indicates the work anticipated and the percentage allocated to each function:

- Administrative Staff (2½): This would include salaries and fringe benefits of not more than 25 percent of on-site personnel, project manager, coordinator, inspectors, social workers, surveyors, clerk(s) etc. as well as centrally



located personnel engaged in urban renewal activities. Salaries and expenses of accounting, purchasing and development personnel would also be covered as well as miscellaneous supplies.

- Public Information (1½%): This would include rental of meeting rooms, literature, special staff and all expenses connected with an information program including mass media activities.
- Relocation (1%): This would include the salaries of relocation personnel and all expenses connected with finding suitable alternative accommodation, but not the actual payments made to displaced families.
- Negotiations (1%): This would include municipal employees or contracted services dealing with negotiations to acquire properties.
- Legal (a) (1½%): This would include all legal work done on behalf of the municipality as purchaser of property whether done by the municipal staff or practising solicitors engaged by the municipality for the purpose.



- Legal (b) (1%): This would include legal fees to cover owner-occupant closing costs and legal costs during negotiations for settlement, but not including expropriation.
- Appraisals (2%): This would include costs of all appraisal work in determining values of properties being acquired, whether done by municipal staff or professional appraisers engaged for the purpose by the municipality.
- Services Design: Rather than charge salaries and expenses of municipal staff engaged in the design and preparation of engineering drawings, the sharable cost would be limited to the fee schedule of the engineering profession in Ontario, based on the contract price.

If this system were adopted, it would have to be considered whether the municipality would be given a global figure within which it could transfer funds from one category to another. The alternative would be to require the municipality to stay within each category and assume the cost if and when the figure is exceeded. An examination of many claims shows considerable overrun in administrative costs as shown in the estimates provided with the application. The principle of providing a fixed sum for municipal administrative spending is worth looking into.



In any case, the province should immediately enter into discussions with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation about assuming a supervisory role in the carrying out of urban renewal activities, and thus relieve Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation of active participation in the administration of agreements.

This would mean the discontinuance of regular meetings of the co-ordinating committee, their substitution by progress reports and other documents and by regular visits by provincial personnel.

More authority and responsibility would be placed on the municipalities and there would be less dependence on decision-making by the senior governments. An outline of the proposals to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation is contained in Appendix "B" attached.

To implement the principle of provincial sovereignty in the administration of urban renewal matters, it will be necessary to discuss the changes proposed with CMHC. The following propositions could serve as terms of reference for discussion.

1. The province intends to place more responsibility on municipalities for the preparation of urban renewal schemes and the implementation of these schemes and will insist on a municipal organization capable of dealing with those responsibilities.





2. The province proposes to assume the supervision of municipalities in carrying out those responsibilities and to relieve CMHC of its active participation in the administration of the agreements.
3. To this end it is proposed to discontinue regular meetings of the co-ordinating committees and technical sub-committees, including the appraisal sub-committees.
4. Meetings of the members of the co-ordinating committee together with such specialists as may be required, can be convened at the call of any of the three parties should circumstances warrant.
5. The municipality will keep the senior governments informed of the activities and seek approvals required by the present agreements through progress reports, acquisition reports, claims, and correspondence submitted to the province. These documents will be passed to CMHC for its information and any comment which it deems necessary.
6. Supervision of the municipality will be provided by the province but CMHC may consult directly with the municipalities for information or for clarification of their actions and may discuss special points with the province which will then give the necessary direction to the municipality.



7. To ensure adequate reporting, required content lists have been prepared for the progress reports and acquisition reports. Forms for claims for implementation (CMHC 1954) are already in use and forms for scheme preparation will be introduced.
8. Policy questions raised either in the progress reports or correspondence will continue to be discussed with CMHC, preferably at the regional office level with decisions passed to the municipality by the province.
9. If necessary, it is proposed to introduce amendments to the existing agreements with municipalities and CMHC, and to prepare a new agreement between the province and CMHC to provide for payment of federal contributions through the province and for approvals of expenditures to be given by the province after consultations with CMHC.
10. Disposal of the federal minister's interest in acquired property other than provided for in the implementation agreement requires approval of CMHC. Unless other arrangements could be made, the province would obtain the consent of CMHC prior to the disposal of each parcel of land. Payment for its share of recoveries from all sources would be made to CMHC by the province.



11. Loans by CMHC to municipalities under section 23c, National Housing Act, would continue to be made directly under the procedures now in effect.
12. It is proposed that commencing April 1, 1970, projects would be undertaken under comprehensive agreements between the province and the federal government providing for the province to enter into agreement with the municipalities about each aspect of urban renewal. Discussions to produce arrangements mutually satisfactory should be undertaken forthwith.
13. Scheme preparation and scheme implementation manuals will be amended to conform with the above. In the meantime temporary instructions will be issued to municipalities presently engaged in urban renewal activities.
14. Draft instructions with attachments follow as Appendix "A" of this report.







3 1761 11547480 1

